

## EPA Official Record

**Notes ID:** 467B8FD6AEFCF7EF798FCDC473FB7121

**From:** "Dave Dilks" <ddilks@limno.com>

**To:** Brian Nickel/R10/USEPA/US@EPA

**Copy To:** <sidf@cdaid.org>; Ben Cope/R10/USEPA/US@EPA; "Clark, Dave" <Dave.Clark@hdrinc.com>

**Delivered Date:** 06/11/2010 02:34 PM PDT

**Subject:** RE: Question about June 10th memo

Brian:

1. Model inputs were set up consistent with the TMDL.

2. The values in Table 2 are transposed, while the body of the text is correct. Table 2 should read:

Simulation	Incremental Impact on Straight Arithmetic Average (mg/l)	Incremental Impact on Volume-Weighted Average (mg/l)
Original	0.0016	0.0035
Replication	-0.0057	-0.0066

Let me know if you or Ben have additional questions.

Dave

-----Original Message-----

From: Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov [mailto:Nickel.Brian@epamail.epa.gov]

Sent: Friday, June 11, 2010 5:07 PM

To: Dave Dilks

Cc: sidf@cdaid.org; Cope.Ben@epamail.epa.gov  
Subject: Question about June 10th memo

Dave:

I just read your June 10th memo, and I've sent it to Ben Cope (who is out today). We may have more questions once Ben gets back.

Based on my initial read, I have two questions:

1. The memo refers to ammonia and CBOD5 "limits." Were the model inputs set equal to 71% of the "limits," or, equivalently, were the model inputs calculated by dividing the "limits" by 1.4, consistent with to the model runs supporting the TMDL?
2. The paragraph discussing the results (Page 2) says that "the alternative Idaho discharge scenario was predicted to increase (DO) by 0.0016 to 0.0035 mg/L for the original simulation. The replication showed a decrease in (DO) of 0.0057 to 0.0066 mg/L." These statements do not match Table 2, which shows that the original simulation showed a DO increase of 0.0016 mg/L using a straight arithmetic average, and a 0.0057 mg/L decrease using a volume-weighted average, and that the replication simulation showed a 0.0035 mg/L increase using a straight arithmetic average, and a decrease of 0.0066 mg/L using a volume-weighted average.

In other words, according to the table, the question of whether the alternative scenario results in an increase or a decrease in DO depends

on how you average the results, whereas the narrative states that this depends on which simulation you're referring to (the original or the replication). Could you please clarify the results?

Thanks,

Brian Nickel, E.I.T.

Environmental Engineer

US EPA Region 10 | Office of Water and Watersheds | NPDES Permits Unit

Voice: 206-553-6251 | Toll Free: 800-424-4372 ext. 6251 | Fax:

206-553-0165

Nickel.Brian@epa.gov

<http://epa.gov/r10earth/waterpermits.htm>

Please conserve natural resources by not printing this message.